

**Central Marin**  
**Community Advisory Committee Recommendations**  
**Draft Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan**

**School Access Element**

**General Comments and Recommendations:**

- School Access projects and programs generally are popular and poll very well. This category could resonate with voters on managing congestion and quality of life issues.
- There is a need to monitor and demonstrate the effectiveness of ongoing programs funded in this element, such as the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Crossing Guard Programs. Programs should be evaluated every 3 years to allow for revision of priorities, programs, and allocations.
- The School Pool ridesharing program should be funded as part of the SR2S program.
- If needed, Local Return funds could be used to augment the School Access element.

**Recommendations for Criteria Evaluating Projects and Programs:**

- Eligible projects should be evaluated against criteria, such as:
  - Project's ability to maximize a mode shift from the "one child per car" mode to other modes, such as bicycling, walking, and car-pooling
  - Project's ability to manage or reduce congestion, especially around schools
  - Project's ability to enhance safety
  - The "leveragability" of outside funds, such as sharing costs of crossing guards with school districts
  - The cost-effectiveness of a project
  - Whether the a program has a successful track record
  - Project's ability to coincide and be implemented with other road improvements

**Recommendations for Illustrative Examples of Projects of Local Significance:**

- Examples of local priorities include:
  - Capital improvements within ½ mile of a school (high priority)
  - The SR2S and Crossing Guard Programs with regular monitoring

**Recommended Funding Allocation:** The majority of the committee thinks that school issues are important to the voter and that most projects and programs in this element should receive full funding with regular program monitoring. Recommended allocations ranged from 10% to 25% with an average of 15.5% and a median of 15%. The variation in funding levels demonstrate that some members at the lower end of the range think that school transit should be moved to the Local

Transit element and that Local Return funds could augment this category if needed, while others at the higher end of the range think that this category will resonate with voters and that it will manage congestion and be cost-effective.

## **Local Streets and Roads Element**

### **General Comments and Recommendations:**

- Local Streets and Roads projects should include the entire right-of-way and consider bicycle, pedestrian, and transit needs, ADA requirements, and traffic calming measures.
- Local Streets and Roads projects should consider implementing improvements called for by applicable local bicycle and pedestrian plans and the Safe Routes to School capital improvements list.
- Streets and roads should not be allowed to deteriorate too much to maintain cost effectiveness of projects.
- The Expenditure Plan should not include a specific list of Roadways of Countywide Significance. Rather, specific criteria for evaluating projects should be provided for the Public Works Directors (with some sort of public review committee for oversight and accountability) to use for prioritization of projects.
- If the Roadways of Countywide Significance list is included, criteria to be placed on that list should include Average Daily Traffic, Level of Service, transit use, bicycle and pedestrian use, ADA needs, and accident rate data.
- Some committee members think that these funds should not be allocated to city by formula as done currently. Rather, the Public Works Directors could prioritize projects based solely on specific criteria (outlined below).
- Local Return funds should be used to fund local community road needs.

### **Recommendations for Criteria Evaluating Projects and Programs:**

- Eligible projects should be evaluated against specific criteria, such as:
  - Congestion relief, especially congestion during peak periods and at known off-peak “hot spots” (highest priority)
  - Need for improvement (condition of road), as determined by an accepted, standardized method to measure degradation
  - Geographic equity
  - Cost-effectiveness and the ability to leverage outside funds, including project’s ability to coincide and be implemented with other programs to get the biggest return on investment

### **Recommendations for Illustrative Examples of Projects of Local Significance:**

- Examples of local priorities include:
  - Intelligent Transportation System technology for signal timing and improved signal responsiveness, which improves traffic flow (e.g., Miracle Mile maintenance and signal coordination with new ITS technology improvements)
  - Operational improvements at the 3rd Street and Union Street intersection

- Major north-south and east-west arterials that carry commuter and school traffic
- If the Joint Committee includes the long list of Roadways of Countywide Significance in the Expenditure Plan, it should be amended to:
  - Change Francisco Boulevard to Francisco Boulevard East
  - Add Francisco Boulevard West
  - Remove Merrydale Road
  - Remove Center Street
  - Add 5th Avenue
  - Remove Smith Ranch Road
- If the Joint Committee includes the short list of Roadways of Countywide Significance, it should be amended to:
  - Add Las Gallinas Avenue/Los Ranchitos Road/Lincoln Avenue
  - Limit North San Pedro Avenue to the China Camp State Park boundary or Sunny Oaks Drive
  - Limit Point San Pedro Avenue to the China Camp State Park boundary or Biscayne Drive
  - Limit Paradise Drive to north of Trestle Glen Boulevard only

**Recommended Funding Allocation:** The committee recognizes and agrees that funding needs for this category are great; however, to maximize voter support, the limited amount of sales tax funds should be focused on projects that will contribute to congestion relief and cost efficiency. Recommended allocations ranged from 12.5% to 20% with an average of 16% and a median of 15%. The variation in funding levels demonstrate that some members at the lower end of the range think that Local Return funds could augment this category if needed, while others at the higher end of the range think that this category needs a higher allocation to ensure improved mobility for other modes.

## Local Transit Element

### General Comments and Recommendations:

- The committee strongly believes that the Local Transit category is the most important element of the draft Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan in terms of ability to address traffic congestion and improve mobility, both locally and on Highway 101.
- A portion of the Local Return funds could be used to enhance transit programs and projects, such as local shuttles.
- Some committee members think that this element should include local shuttles and shuttle coordination, rather than just providing seed money for shuttle services.
- If local shuttles are included in this element, vehicles should meet school bus standards. Shuttles could be used for both schools and other transit services during other times of the day.
- Some committee members think that this element should include technical assistance for organizing subscription buses, club buses, or other shared ride

options to reduce peak-period congestion (Transportation Demand Management measure focusing on large employers or clusters of smaller employers). Such shared-ride services may include origins outside of the county to accommodate our non-resident workers and reduce congestion on Highway 101.

- This element should specifically include enhancements to paratransit service for seniors and persons with disabilities.
- This element should fund a detailed study and implementation of a long-term structure for providing local transit services in Marin County. Golden Gate Transit and the Marin County Transit District need to work together to ensure that efficient and cost-effective transit services are provided and operating routes, frequencies, and scheduling are reviewed carefully to meet local needs.
- Transit centers may improve efficiency but may not resonate with voters. If included, transit centers do not need to elaborate to keep costs down but they should provide current bus schedule information, bicycle storage, and basic amenities.

### **Recommendations for Criteria Evaluating Projects and Programs:**

- Eligible projects should be evaluated against criteria, such as:
  - Project's ability to manage or reduce congestion
  - With exception to paratransit services, cost effectiveness (e.g., subsidy per person-trip or person-mile)
  - Equity in serving the needs of transit-dependent populations
  - Ability to leverage outside funds and project's ability to implement the right kind of service to an area to get the biggest return on investment
- Capital expenditures should be matching funds only, should emphasize coordination and better planning, and should be included only if there is a clear need.

### **Recommendations for Illustrative Examples of Projects of Local Significance:**

- Examples of priorities include:
  - Operating needs over capital needs
  - Transportation Demand Management and other commuter services that increase transit use (e.g., subscription or club buses that have few stops or peak period feeder buses)
  - Shared-ride taxi service that augments paratransit services

**Recommended Funding Allocation:** The committee strongly believes that this element is the most important component of the Expenditure Plan in terms of ability to address traffic congestion and improve mobility. It should be noted that only one committee member recommended an allocation below 50% for this category in an effort to ensure more funds to other travel modes, such as bicycle and pedestrian projects. Recommended allocations ranged from 40% to 60% with an average of 54.1% and a median of 55%.

### General Comments and Recommendations:

- Local jurisdictions should have full discretion in determining Local Return projects. A local citizen's advisory committee should be formed to oversee expenditure of Local Return funds using a list of very flexible criteria developed locally to evaluate projects.
- Specific procedures should be outlined for determining Local Return projects, which includes meaningful public input opportunities.
- Local Return funds should be available as local match funds.
- Unexpended Local Return funds should be allowed to accumulate.
- Provisions should be included to allow communities to work together to jointly leverage Local Return funds and implement larger projects.

### Recommendations for Criteria Evaluating Projects and Programs:

- Eligible Local Return projects should be evaluated against locally developed criteria, such as:
  - Project's ability to reduce or manage congestion, such as impact on Level of Service
  - Ability to leverage outside funds
  - Project readiness
  - Ability to help achieve General Plan transportation goals
  - Projects that are neighborhood-based
  - Projects that increase the use of technology for traffic management and improve use/capacity of existing infrastructure
  - Projects that emphasize alternative modes, including Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management
- It must be recognized that priorities change over time and, therefore, flexibility in the evaluation criteria is important. A local citizen's advisory committee should be involved in setting the evaluation criteria.

### Recommendations for Illustrative Examples of Projects of Local Significance:

- The committee recommends that projects be chosen by a list of locally developed, flexible criteria and that any projects listed below are illustrative examples.
- Bike and pedestrian paths that link communities should be a priority. Examples are:
  - Access to the Canal area
  - Shoreline Pathway
  - The North-South Bikeway
  - Terra Linda Promenade
  - ADA improvements and compliance
  - Implementing projects and improvements of existing community bike/pedestrian plans
- Traffic improvements that enhance safety, improve mobility, and reduce congestion should be a priority. Examples are:

- Transportation System Management measures that improve use/capacity of existing infrastructure
- 3rd Street and Union Street intersection improvements
- Miracle Mile improvements

**Recommended Funding Allocation:** Recommended allocations ranged from 7% to 20% with an average of 15.2% and a median of 15%. This range generally reflects the degree to which committee members think Local Return funds should be used to augment other elements.

#### **Additional Comments and Recommendations for Other Aspects of the Draft Plan:**

- Fund management, accountability, cost effectiveness, simplicity, appealing to environmental sensibilities, and having the most impact on congestion and quality of life were identified as important voter issues related to a transportation sales tax ballot measure.
- Outreach, education, and polling are necessary components for marketing and fine-tuning a transportation sales tax ballot measure.
- “Easy” projects should be delivered early so people see immediate, positive results of the measure.
- Outreach efforts and messages need to:
  - Make clear how a sales tax will maintain and enhance our quality of life
  - Emphasize accountability throughout the measure
  - Emphasize objective project evaluation criteria wherever possible
  - Show that sales tax funds can be used for emergencies (e.g., loaning sales tax funds for the Highway 101 Gap Closure project)
  - Make clear that sales tax funds can be used as “pay as you go” funds or saved, leveraged, or bonded for larger projects
  - Emphasize the importance of local transit as part of an overall integrated plan to achieve improvement at the regional level